

obligation. It is doing unto others as you would have them do unto you.

God knew there was a danger here—that men would get intensely interested in the work and yet forget the workers, and so he made abundant provision for the priesthood under the old economy. And when Israel was entering upon her wars of conquest He said once and again, "Take heed that ye forsake not the Levite for he hath no part nor inheritance with thee." And under the new dispensation we read, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they that preach the gospel shall live of the gospel."

Surely our sessions ought to shake off the lethargy that has bound them. The last General Assembly called upon the elders to assist in presenting this cause. If the pastor feels that it is too personal a matter see that some elder is selected to stand up and speak out about the need of the ministers who have spent their lives in the hard mission fields.

Whenever the cause is presented, the obligation laid upon the people, and the needs of these servants of Christ and our church mentioned, there is always a ready and liberal response.

If better salaries were furnished our workers there would be less need in twenty-five years for the work of Ministerial Relief. I have heard business men in all parts of our church say, "Living expenses have increased more than thirty per cent in the past ten years." And yet how few of our ministers' salaries have been increased! What business sense must be possessed either by our ministers or by their wives! Think of ministers on a salary less than a negro fireman on a railroad train, buying the necessary books for their library, educating their sons and daughters, contributing to the many calls that ever come to the man of God, living as becometh the minister of the gospel, and always bringing comfort and encouragement to others. What provision can he make for his old age? What hope has he for the widow and children should he first be called home?

Some may think he draws the indictment a little too severe, but those of us who have the burden of the work of relief upon us will be ready to pardon Mr. Tator when he says of the self-denying ministers who are now in need: "Many of them have received, and others receive today, contracts from churches reading, 'and that you may be free from worldly cares and avocations we pledge ourselves to pay you in regular monthly payments the sum of four hundred dollars per annum.'" In some cases substitute two hundred, three hundred, five hundred or six hundred dollars for the four hundred dollars, but in every case read "that you may be free from worldly cares." Is it humor or irony? It is neither. It is pathos. It is a disgrace. If we can not, or will not, take care of the ministers we have, why do we multiply our churches? The millions of Christians of the United States today stand indicted of the crime of wilful neglect, before the bar of righteous justice. The evidence offered is to be found in the tears, heartaches, hunger, threadbare clothes of ministers' families.

This is the month when the Presbyterian church in the South is called upon to contribute to the cause of Ministerial Relief. We are beginning to do much better things for our old ministers. Let the good work go on.

LIMITATIONS.

(II Cor. 12:5.)

The stream when on the plain spread out
Moves quickly along,
But when 'tis buttressed all about
With banks rock-ribbed and strong,
Then it becomes the torrent fierce.

That subtle agency called steam,
When left to freely rise,
Would be most powerful, 'twould seem;
But no; in young Watt's eyes
'Twas when confined, and not when free,
Man's faithful servant it would be.

So human life, shut in by ills
Of which this flesh is heir,
Develops strength of mind that wills
To nobly do and dare;
And wondrous deeds, or subtle thought
Into creations new are wrought.

In limitations, then, of life,
Not liberty, is found
That which wins best in daily strife
And makes the man abound
In all that's Godlike, noble, grand,
That greatest love and praise command.

—Exchange.

JOHN MARK, THE "QUITTER."

By Rev. T. M. McConnell.

He didn't desert, he simply quit. He didn't steal away secretly under the cover of darkness, but he just deliberately stopped and refused to go any farther. He doubtless told Paul and his uncle Barnabas his reasons for not being willing to go, but Luke did not see fit to record them in his history, and so we are left to conjecture. He was perhaps disappointed in missionary life. The glamour of romance soon faded away in the presence of real trials, difficulties and dangers. A missionary's pathway does not usually run through flower gardens, and beside babbling brooks, and this case was no exception. There were not only difficulties in it, but dangers, real dangers, not merely imaginary ones, as the scenes witnessed a little later at Iconium and Lystra very clearly proved. Or it may be he had grown weary of the journey, possibly seasick, or at any rate homesick, and anxious to enjoy once more the comforts and conveniences of city life. Or perhaps he had become "disgruntled" because his uncle, who had occupied the place of leadership up to that time, had been superseded by Paul. Or it is barely possible that he may have had some little pet plan of his own, which Paul, as the now leader, failed to sanction or approve, and in a "fit of sulks," "departing from them he returned to Jerusalem." But whatever his reasons were, they were not satisfactory to Paul, who having found him unreliable once, was unwilling to risk him a second time.

He doubtless believed, then, as he afterward taught, that a Christian ought to "endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ," and so ought not to allow difficulties and dangers to turn him from the pathway of duty. He remembered that the Master "though he